

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 9 have been canceled, claims 7, 8 and 20 have been amended and new claims 26 and 27 have been added. Thus, claims 7-8 and 10-27 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Rejections Under Section 102:

Claims 7 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e), the Examiner contending that these claims are anticipated by Buisker et al (USPN 7,075,099).

Applicant's Claim 7 recites:

*wherein the first unit is designed as a filed device having a **first communication device**, and wherein the first unit is connectable to a field bus via the first communication device*

and

*at least one second unit containing a detector, wherein the second unit is designed as field device having a **second communication device**, and wherein the second unit is connectable to the field bus via the second communication device*

In contrast, Buisker et al teaches only one communication between a controller and the edge detector assembly (see Col. 3, Lines 57-64 and Fig 1) and not a first and second communication device.

In view of the above, claim 7 is not anticipated by Buisker et al. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 102 rejections.

Applicant's Claim 20 recites:

*wherein the first unit and the second unit are **separately** connected
to a field bus*

In contrast, Buisker et al teaches only one communication between a controller and the edge detector assembly (see Col. 3, Linies 57-64 and Fig 1) and not a separate connection to the field bus for a first and second unit.

In view of the above, claim 20 is not anticipated by Buisker et al. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 102 rejections.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 7-8 and 10-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Tell et al (USPN 5,173,749) in view of Tian et al. (A Field bus-based intelligent sensor).

Applicant's Claim 7 recites:

*wherein the first unit is designed as a filed device having a **first communication device**, and wherein the first unit is connectable to a field bus via the first communication device*
and
*at least one second unit containing a detector, wherein the second unit is designed as field device having a **second communication device**, and wherein the second unit is connectable to the field bus via the second communication device*

Neither Tell et al. nor Tian et al. disclose or suggest to use two communication device, one for each unit, so that the first and second unit are separately connected to the field bus. MPEP 2134 requires that the combination of references teach each and every element of the claimed invention. There for the rejection must fail.

Applicant's Claim 20 recites:

*wherein the first unit and the second unit are **separately** connected
to a field bus*

Neither Tell et al. nor Tian et al. disclose or suggest to use separate field bus connections for each unit, the first unit and the second unit. MPEP 2134 requires that the combination of references teach each and every element of the claimed invention. There for the rejection must fail.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 7 and 20 are patentable and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the Section 103 rejection. Furthermore, Claims 8 and 10-19 which depend on claim 7 and Claims 21-27 which depend on claim 20 are also patentable at least based on their dependence from claim 7 or 20 as well as based on their own merits.

Furthermore Applicant's Claim 10 recites:

*wherein the first and the second units are designed to communicate
with one another via the field bus according to a **slave-slave**
transmission method*

The Examiner has ignored this limitation of a **slave-slave transmission**, even so the references have to teach or suggest every element of the claim (see MPEP 2143). Thus, the Examiner has not made a proper rejection of claim 10. The above discussion of claim 10 is also applicable to claim 23, having also the limitation of a **slave-slave transmission**.

New Claims:

New claims further define the scope of the invention as described in the specification and drawings. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding the other claims, Applicant respectfully submits claims 7-8 and 10-27 are patentable and requests allowance of claims 7-8 and 10-27.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 11, 2008

By: Daniel J. Ryan
Daniel J. Ryan
Registration No. 61,232
(407) 736-6096

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830